



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

French troops entered Rome, September 20, 1870 (p. 44). Von Mühler was an unpopular not a popular minister (p. 47). Fueter's excellent work on historiography and the two volumes of Vogt and Koch on German literary history were evidently not used in connection with chapter VI., and are missing from the bibliography, which is only a supplement to those in the preceding volumes.

English historical writing on this period done even in the midst of war may point with pride to the excellent tone of this work, but among recent works the equally dispassionate life of Bismarck by Robertson and the two volumes on German history since 1867 by Dawson are much more satisfying than the volume under review.

GUY STANTON FORD.

Modern Germany, its Rise, Growth, Downfall, and Future. By J. ELLIS BARKER. Sixth edition. (New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. 1919. Pp. ix, 496. \$6.00.)

IT is difficult to recall an English author who devoted himself more assiduously to anti-German propaganda before the war than Mr. J. Ellis Barker; there are few whose work was more useful in rousing the intellectuals in England to a sense of real danger. The importance of Mr. Barker's contributions was somewhat overshadowed by his Conservative affiliations during a Liberal régime but they are not likely to be denied by students of opinion during the war. As one of those friendly to Mr. Barker's general thesis and to many of his convictions, I should find myself in a quandary were it not for the fact that the question upon which I am to pass is the immediate value to the professional historian of the sixth edition, rewritten and enlarged, of Mr. Barker's best-known book. It may not also be beyond the point to touch upon the probability that the book may possess the elements of as valuable a judgment on the present situation in Germany as a contemporary author, as avowedly hostile to Germany, is able to attain.

The groundwork of the book was a number of articles contributed originally by Mr. Barker to the *Nineteenth Century and After*, and the additions to the book are certain of the articles written by Mr. Barker since its original publication, including some three or four written during the war. Without having made any elaborate examination, it does not seem to me that the material content of the book is as substantially changed as the publisher's announcement declares. Mr. Barker's own foreword is much more modest. The last two chapters on the future of Germany and Austria are the only portions which are really fresh and which contain Mr. Barker's latest convictions. They suffer inevitably from the fact that they were written immediately after the armistice. Mr. Barker feels that Germany is thoroughly exhausted by the war and that an immediate renewal of the issue is out of the question. He even thinks it probable that "by her attack in 1914, Germany has destroyed

not only the Empire but the future of the German race". If Germany should remain united, "it will be utterly ruined economically", but, as it seemed to him likely that the nation would divide into several parts, it would be doubly ruined. Mr. Barker concedes to the German advocates the point that, if economic and political conditions should remain on an ante-bellum basis, Germany would by 1950 possess in man-power and economic resources an overwhelming superiority to France and perhaps to Great Britain as well, but he felt in November, 1918, that the war was practically certain to limit Germany in territory and resources, resulting in an industrial stagnation which would retard the growth of population, and thus, by the transfer of industries to countries more favorably situated, actually to produce by 1950 a condition which would make the white population of Great Britain, and even France, larger than that of Germany. He saw "a democratic, impoverished, and sobered Germany".

The soundness of the historical portions of the book is certainly open to considerable argument. His proposition that the policy and character of "Prusso-Germany" "changed completely" under William II. is not one which the majority of students are likely to accept. The majority of books written before and during the war have been chiefly concerned with showing the identity of procedure during the reign of William II. and that of his predecessors, and, even though Pan-Germanism may not have been full-fledged in 1888, it was in existence and the main features of German constitutional life and economic procedure already thoroughly in being. There is again no constructive fact more important than Mr. Barker's opinion that the ante-bellum government in Germany was opposed "by the great bulk of the Electorate". This leads straight to the conclusion that the new government is genuinely democratic, representative of the people, and probably trustworthy, and gives real point to Mr. Barker's statement "that a new Germany is arising".

It is again very definitely stated (p. 311) that one-third of the German people were Socialists and also members of the Social-Democratic party. One of the commonest propositions of the political scientist has been the fact that the Social-Democratic party drew its chief strength from the elements of liberal and radical political and constitutional reform rather than from the Socialists properly so called. If we accept the estimates of the Socialists themselves as to their number, we shall not count any third of the German population. Mr. Barker also juggles with names when he declares that Germany "lacked a powerful liberal party", for pretty nearly any German, whatever his political stripe, would instantly reply that the largest and most flourishing German party before the war was a liberal party, *the* liberal party, the Social-Democrats themselves.

These facts are so essential to any judgment or conclusion about the last fifty years of German history that it is hardly likely that those who will quarrel with Mr. Barker about them as I do will approve of his

general historical propositions or agree that his facts and figures warrant his conclusions. I make myself no great pretensions to a knowledge of German history, but when Mr. Barker declares as a general proposition that the King of Prussia had during the nineteenth century more power than Napoleon I., he seems to me to show very little knowledge about the actual operation of constitutional machinery in Germany and still less about Napoleon. It seems to me to be conceded that the government in Germany was in the hands of a group of men who ruled partly through the imperial prerogative, partly through the Prussian legislative and administrative machinery, but chiefly through the Bundesrat. We learn also from Mr. Barker that modern Germany was the creation of the Hohenzollerns. One may query what he proposes to do with the generally accepted historical tenets about Stein, Maassen, and Bismarck. A not too extensive familiarity with Bismarck's correspondence would tend to show that his work was done despite a good deal of opposition on the part of the Hohenzollerns, and the least knowledge about Stein's life would prove that the great difficulty encountered in 1808 was the opposition of the crown. But when we find that Germany itself was merely "an enlarged Prussia", it seems clear that Mr. Barker's prime source of information on German history has been the Pan-Germanists and that he has read them with a rather hasty glance. Surely the history of Germany before 1870 will scarcely lead to the conclusion that Germany is merely an enlarged Prussia. The history of the German states since 1870 and their hostility to Prussia is scarcely consistent with Mr. Barker's larger proposition. It is a pity that a man who had so much to say that was true and who succeeded on the whole in saying a good deal so well should not have contented himself with his main proposition.

ROLAND G. USHER.

Impressions of the Kaiser. By DAVID JAYNE HILL, former American Ambassador to Germany. (New York and London: Harper and Brothers. 1918. Pp. 368. \$2.00.)

THE work has a "selling title" which does not do justice to its contents. It will prove a disappointment to the reader who expects from the former ambassador to Germany an informal record of personal and diplomatic experiences, such as have given to the pages of Gerard, Whitlock, and Morgenthau a raciness not always consonant with traditional ideas of diplomatic discretion and dignity. In Dr. Hill's work the personal element is hesitatingly introduced and in no way affects the serious and scholarly tone of the book, which is in the main a review of German foreign policy under William II., with an attempt to define the Kaiser's responsibility for the growth and expression of the war spirit among the German people. In some chapters, indeed, like those dealing with German relations to Great Britain in 1912 (ch. VIII.) and British efforts for peace, retraced in the light of Lichnowsky's memorandum (ch. IX.),